

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 15 stands objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-9, 12, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,655,771 to Matsumoto et al. (“Matsumoto”).

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 19.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claim 15 is amended to eliminate informalities. Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 17, and 18 are amended to further define the invention. Claim 19 is amended to add the missing word “correcting” in the preamble.

**The Claims Do Not Contain Objectionable Subject Matter**

Claim 15 stands objected to because of informalities. Claim 15 is amended to eliminate the informalities. In particular, the first and second “controlling units” are renamed the first and second “controller units.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 15 be withdrawn.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-9, 12, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,655,771 to Matsumoto et al. (“Matsumoto”). Independent claims 1, 5, 8, 12, and 17 are amended to add the limitation of the controlling unit controlling timing to discharge ink droplets roughly based on a printing pulse and controlling timing to discharge drops finely based on a controlling pulse having a frequency higher than that of the printing pulse. Similarly,

claim 18 is amended to include the limitation of the timing of ink droplet discharge being controlled roughly by a printing pulse and finely by a controlling pulse having a higher frequency than that of the printing pulse. Matsumoto does not disclose or suggest a controlling unit controlling timing to discharge ink droplets roughly based on a printing pulse and controlling timing to discharge drops finely based on a controlling pulse having a frequency higher than that of the printing pulse. Nor does Matsumoto disclose the timing of ink droplet discharge being controlled roughly by a printing pulse and finely by a controlling pulse having a higher frequency than that of the printing pulse. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 17, and 18, and their dependent claims 2-4, 6, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn for at least the above reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: March 14, 2006

By:   
Kent Basson  
Registration No. 48,125

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
202.739.3000